

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 09/841,017

First named inventor: Ranjit Sabota

Filed: April 23, 2001

Examiner: Ries, Laurie Anne

Art Unit: 2176

Docket No. 40004572-0001-002

Confirmation No.: 5826

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action admits that claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 are patentable over the combination of and Spyglass Prism", but seeks to add the teachings of Lewis to render the claims obvious. This conclusion is flawed.

Lewis (U.S. Patent 6,513,019) describes an integrated data reporting system for real time data entry, assessment, and report generation. In this system, business rules are used to extract information from incoming transactions such as messages. Lewis col. 6 ll. 7-14, col. 16 ll. 38-63. Hence, this reference does not teach acquisition and extraction of data from disparate content using and under the control of capture templates, as is presently claimed. Like the DOM templates described by Whittedge, Lewis' business rule may describe how information is extracted from the incoming messages, but they play no part in controlling any data acquisition. Thus, ven when considered in combination the cited references simply would not yield a scheme in which capture templates are used to acquire content from disparate sources in the manner claimed. hence, the claims are patentable over these references.

The Office Action further admits that claims 3 and 8 are patentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and Lonnroth, and that claims 5 and 10 are patentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and Arens. As indicated above, adding the teachings of Lewis does nothing to cure any underlying deficiencies in the rejections of the independent claims from which these claims depend, hence, these claims are patentable over the combinations of Whitledge, Spyglass Prism, Lonnroth and/or Arens, even when considered in combination with Lewis.

The Office Action also admits that claims 59-61 are patentable over Whitledge, even in view of Lee, but seeks to combine the teachings of Whitledge and Lewis to reject these claims as obvious. This conclusion is flawed.

The Examiner has admitted Whitledge does not describe the use of acquisition rules stored in a repository. Lewis describes the use of stored business rules that are used to extract desired information from incoming transactions. Lewis col. 6 ll. 7-14. However, even if these business rules are considered to be acquisition rules, they would be acquisition rules for *incoming transactions*. They would not be acquisition rules for harvesting content and media assets from disparate content sources, as recited in claim 59. Hence, combining the teachings of Lewis with those of Whitledge would not yield the present invention and claims 59-61 are patentable over the combination of Whitledge and Lewis.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: January 18, 2008

/Tarek N. Fahmi/

Tarek N. Fahmi

Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
650-798-0320